

<b>Your Details</b>	
First Name:	Peter
Last Name:	Weir
<b>1</b>	
Do you think we should decrease our day-to-day levels of service to reduce the average rate increase? :	No
Why / Why not?:	<p>While acknowledging Ashburton District Councils recent lift in investment in drinking water infrastructure, Council, like many others, has historically under-spent on its 3 Waters, delivering drinking water to its small rural communities that fails to meet long standing drinking water standards. Unless the upgrade plans are overtaken by Central Government Three waters reform (which Council vigorously opposes) then Council urgently needs to spend more on provision of safe drinking water, not defer that work, politically expedient as that might be. Council must urgently respond to the fact that Ashburton leads the NZ Ministry of Health's 2020-21 "list of shame" <a href="https://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications/annual-report-on-drinking-water-quality-2020-2021-mar22.pdf">https://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications/annual-report-on-drinking-water-quality-2020-2021-mar22.pdf</a> (page 18) Eight large supplies failed to comply with the protozoal Standards: Ashburton, Christchurch, Hastings Urban, Queenstown, Richmond/Waimea Industrial, Taupō – Lake Terrace, Tokoroa and Wānaka (page 73) Ashburton, Chertsey, Fairton, Hakatere, Hinds, Mayfield, Mt Somers, Methven, Rakaia all failed to meet the NZ standards for protoza. Separately Council should work with neighbouring Selwyn District to restart the largely mothballed former Solid Energy \$68 million Canola (rape seed) oil to biodiesel plant at Rolleston to provide and alternative transport fuel to diesel refined from fossil fuel, or simply duplicate that plant in the Ashburton industrial area. Innovation at scale would enable the District's farmers to de-carbonise their fuel-intensive farming operations. The Rolleston plant was before its time but its time has come again given the government reintroduction of a biofuels obligation. Parts of this 2016 video are now well dated but the over view is useful <a href="https://www.ruraldelivery.net.nz/posts/Green-Fuels-Biodiesel">https://www.ruraldelivery.net.nz/posts/Green-Fuels-Biodiesel</a></p>
If so, what should we do less of?:	Council needs to do much more to lower the communities dependence on fossil fuels and consequent Greenhouse Gas emissions across its district, not less.
<b>2</b>	
Do you agree with using \$1.7 million from our forestry	No

reserve to pay for major roading repairs?:	
Why / why not?:	<p>Absolutely not. This is an outrageous proposal! Council Forestry should never be asked to cross-subsidise rural roading. Milk tankers and other heavy trucks and heavily loaded agricultural tractor/trailers are responsible for the road demand and consequent pavement wear and edge break (logging trucks carting from logs from council plantations represent only a tiny part of the road demand in the district). Revenue and operating surplus from forestry should be recycled back into purchase of bare land in the foothills for and afforestation using fast growing exotic tree species to take advantage of revenue from sale of NZUs under the NZ emissions trading scheme, while providing offsets to Council's high emissions activities, working towards a Carbon -neutral Council and provide recharging infrastructure for lower emissions transport fleets (Electric Vehicles).</p>
<b>3</b>	
General comments:	<p>Council should lobby central government to increase the RUCs take and hence rebate via GPS tracked RUCs (Smart RUCs). Its likely that Fonterra milk tankers' RUCs are credited to Timaru district because that's where the fleet is registered, and Synlait milk tankers' RUCs are credited to Selwyn District. A targeted rate (general rural) heavy transport should be struck driven by Equivalent Axle loads per hectare (diary would face a significant increase). User Pays must apply. Southland District has an economic model to shape a targeted rate.</p>